

Applicant: Yu-Lien Huang, et al.  
Serial No.: 10/656,586  
Attorney Docket No.: 67,200-1133

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending herein.

Claims 9-20 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-8 are rejected.

Claim 1 is currently amended.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. It was stated that the term "confine ring" in claim 5 is not described in the specification to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

It will be noted that the specification has been amended to replace "confine ring" with "confinement ring" wherever the term "confine ring" previously appeared in the specification.

It will further be noted that claim 5 has been amended to replace the term "confine ring" with "confinement ring".

Therefore, in light of the amendments to the specification and claim 5, it is respectfully submitted that the specification describes the confinement ring recited in claim 5 in such a manner as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention, as prescribed by 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Reconsideration and allowance of amended claim 5 is therefore respectfully solicited.

Applicant: Yu-Jien Huang, et al.  
Serial No.: 10/656,586  
Attorney Docket No.: 67,200-1133

Specification

The disclosure was objected to because the term "confine ring" is used throughout the specification and it was stated that it is not clear what the term "confine ring" means.

As was noted herein above, the specification has been amended to replace "confine ring" with "confinement ring" wherever the term "confine ring" previously appeared in the specification.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the specification overcome the objection to the specification. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification is therefore respectfully solicited.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to because the confine ring is drawn as a solid plate and not a ring in all the drawings. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) were required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Accordingly, corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121 (d) are submitted with the present response. In the corrected drawing sheets, the confinement ring is drawn as a ring rather than as a solid plate. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is therefore respectfully solicited.

Applicant: Yu-Tien Huang, et al.  
Serial No.: 10/656,586  
Attorney Docket No.: 67,200-1133

---

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C 102

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lill et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,228,208).

It is respectfully submitted that Lill et al. fails to anticipate claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) on the grounds that Lill et al. fails to disclose each and every limitation of claims 1-4.

Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that Lill et al. fails to disclose an apparatus comprising "a process chamber having a chamber wall; a showerhead provided in said process chamber; and a plurality of exterior fasteners extending laterally through said chamber wall and into said showerhead", as set forth in amended claim 1, and therefore, defined by claims 2-4 as dependent therefrom.

In contrast, Lill et al. discloses a process chamber (112) comprising chamber walls (102), a top wall (114) supported by the chamber walls and a showerhead (118) secured to the top wall using fasteners (128, 129) which extend vertically through the top wall (112).

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Lill et al. fails to disclose each and every limitation set forth in amended claim 1, and therefore, defined by claims 2-4 as dependent from amended claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Lill et al. fails to anticipate amended claim 1, and claims 2-4 as dependent from amended claim 1, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Reconsideration

Applicant: Yo-Lien Huang, et al.  
Serial No.: 10/656,586  
Attorney Docket No.: 67,200-1133

and allowance of claims 1-4 is therefore respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lilleland et al., (U.S. Pat. No. 6,073,577).

It is respectfully submitted that Lilleland et al. fails to anticipate claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) on the grounds that Lilleland et al. fails to disclose each and every limitation of claims 1-8.

Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that Lilleland et al. fails to disclose an apparatus comprising "a process chamber having a chamber wall; a showerhead provided in said process chamber; and a plurality of exterior fasteners extending laterally through said chamber wall and into said showerhead", as set forth in amended claim 1, and therefore, defined by claims 2-8 as dependent therefrom.

In contrast, Lilleland et al. teaches a process chamber (Fig. 1) comprising a chamber lid to which a showerhead (14) is secured using multiple fasteners (unlabeled) which extend vertically through the chamber lid.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Lilleland et al. fails to disclose each and every limitation set forth in amended claim 1, and therefore, defined by claims 2-8 as dependent from amended claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Lilleland et al. fails to anticipate amended claim 1, and claims 2-8 as dependent from amended claim 1, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8 is therefore

Applicant: Yu-Lien Huang, et al.  
Serial No.: 10/656,586  
Attorney Docket No.: 67,200-1133

respectfully solicited.

*Conclusion*

Every effort has been made to amend applicant's claims in order to define his invention in the scope to which it is entitled. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Randy W. Tung  
Reg. No. 31,311